A 5030-1 F 12/87

NATIONALLY NORMED ELEMENTARY ACHIEVEMENT TESTING IN AMERICA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HOW ALL FIFTY STATES ARE ABOVE THE NATIONAL AVERAGE

JOHN JACOB CANNELL
FRIENDS FOR EDUCATION

Working For Accountability
in Public Education

Thanks to Malinda Thacker, Tammy Quesenberry, John Casto, Tammy Powers, and Anita Lilly for their many long hours collecting data and revising manuscripts. Also, thanks to Dr. Charles Yeargin and Dr. Bruce Hall for their suggestions and criticisms. Special thanks to my wife, Ina, whose patience and encouragement were invaluable.

My thanks also to Esalen Institute in Big Sur, California, where this project was conceived and where I found the energy for its completion.

John Jacob Cannell, M.D., is a physician in the private practice of medicine in Beckley, West Virginia. He is President of Friends For Education, a non-profit, citizen group interested in accountability in public education.

Additional copies of this report are available for $5.00 from Friends For Education, Box 358, Daniels, West Virginia 25832-0358.

Copyright © 1987 by Friends For Education
All rights reserved.

NATIONALLY NORMED ELEMENTARY ACHIEVEMENT TESTING IN AMERICA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HOW ALL FIFTY STATES ARE ABOVE THE NATIONAL AVERAGE

by
John Jacob Cannell
FRIENDS FOR EDUCATION

Commercially available, nationally normed achievement tests are used by virtually every school district in the nation, including all fifty-five districts in West Virginia. The most recent scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) had West Virginia above the national average at all grade levels tested. Third graders tested at the 65 percentile and sixth graders at the 62 percentile, compared to the national average of 50. "How much improvement is needed? We are already above the national average!" is a point frequently made by the educators.

The United States Department of Education reports that West Virginia has the highest percentage of adults without a college education, the second lowest per capita income, and the third lowest college entrance scores (ACT) in the nation ("State Education Statistics"). No one denies the problems in West Virginia's public schools.

Friends for Education wondered how West Virginia could do so well on the nationally normed CTBS test. If West Virginia is above average, what state is below average? How could West Virginia do so poorly on every other indicator of student performance but consistently test above the national average on the nationally normed, commercially available CTBS test?

Friends for Education surveyed all fifty states and discovered that no state is below average at elementary level on any of the six major nationally normed, commercially available tests! A few states had one or two elementary grade levels below average or an occasional subject that was below average, but most states had all subject areas and all elementary grade levels well above the national average.

Friends for Education sent letters to the superintendents and testing coordinators of all fifty states in August of 1987. Forty-three responded within one month and the remaining seven responded to a second letter. Information obtained included the name of the test used (Table I), the norms used, the dates of administration, the statistical method used to report the scores, the

number of students tested, and the most current reading, language, math, and basic battery scores. Most states also supplied the percentage of students testing above average at each grade level as well as the number and percentage of districts testing above average in that particular state.

The states reported data using many different statistical reporting methods, such as national percentile rank, normal curve equivalent, grade equivalent scores, and others. Friends for Education reprinted the scores as received from the states and did not perform any additional statistical operations on the data.

Friends for Education found that these standardized, nationally normed achievement tests give children, parents, school systems, legislatures, and the press misleading reports on achievement levels. **These tests allow all the states to claim to be above the national average!** The tests -- Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), California Achievement Test (CAT), Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), and Science Research Associates (SRA) -- **allow 90 percent of the school districts in the United States to claim to be above average. More than 70 percent of the students tested nationwide are told they are performing above the national average.**

Friends for Education found that thirty-two states test elementary children on a statewide basis, and all thirty-two are testing above the national average (Table II). Many of these states rank below the national average on standard barometers of excellence, such as per capita income, graduation rates, performance on college entrance examinations, and statewide literacy rates ("State Education Statistics"). Such states include Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas -- all of which are claiming to be above the national average and most of which are claiming to be well above average.

In the remaining eighteen states, local districts administer the tests, but without statewide control (Table III). Most of these states had no knowledge of individual district results, so Friends for Education telephoned the largest school districts in each of these states and obtained the scores and the tests used; all eighteen states had the vast majority of the surveyed districts above the national average. These larger districts often include metropolitan areas with many inner city children, a group often thought to be below the norm. Instead, most of these inner city districts were claiming to be above average, including Trenton, New Jersey; East Orange, New Jersey; New York, New York; Boston, Massachusetts; Springfield, Massachusetts; St. Louis, Missouri; Kansas City, Missouri; East St. Louis, Missouri; and Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Standard principles of mathematics make it difficult for more than one half of any group to be above the group average. However, these tests do not use a current group average for comparison, but rather use a "norm

group" from the past for comparison, so it is statistically possible for 100 percent of current students tested to be above average, a point seldom explained by the educators. Most testing companies renorm the test only every eight to ten years; as a result, current students' achievement is being compared to students' achievement from years past. **Educators claim that the high scores reflect improved achievement levels, but Friends for Education suspects that inaccurate initial norms and teaching the test may be the reasons for high scores.** The main concern is that the general public and the press do not understand the scores reported on norm reference tests. An above-average score does not mean that the student or the district or the state is currently above average. It means only that the score achieved is better than the mean score achieved by the norm group in years past.

Every state in the south except Louisiana uses these tests on a statewide basis, and every southern state tests well above the national average with the exception of Mississippi, which is at the national norm with an average elementary normal curve equivalent (N.C.E.) of 50.1. In Oklahoma, third graders tested at the 62 percentile nationwide on the MAT although Oklahoma is behind the nation in per capita income, graduation rate, and college entrance scores ("State Education Statistics").

In South Carolina, where per capita income ranks forty-seventh, graduation rate is forty-seventh, and college entrance scores are the lowest in the nation ("State Education Statistics"), 62.9 percent of the fourth graders tested above the national average on the CTBS total battery. Although Georgia is behind the nation in per capita income, graduation rate, and Scholastic Aptitude college admission test scores ("State Education Statistics"), more than 68 percent of Georgia's second graders tested above the national average on ITBS.

In Kentucky, 79.6 percent of the third graders were told that they are above the national average on a modified CTBS test although Kentucky ranks below the nation in per capita income, graduation rate, and college entrance scores ("State Education Statistics"). And in Tennessee, second graders had a national average group percentile rank of 86 percent in mathematics and language although Tennessee is below average in per capita income, graduation rate, and college entrance scores ("State Education Statistics").

The eighteen states where the districts test independently are usually those states that rank high on standard barometers of excellence. Friends for Education feels certain, after sampling the large districts, that the vast majority of districts in these states are testing above average. This finding is not surprising; if poor southern states have a majority of districts above average, then wealthier northeast and midwest states should have virtually 100 percent of their districts above average on the same tests. For example,

Iowa has the highest college entrance scores in the nation and the third highest graduation rate ("State Education Statistics"); 95.8 percent of its schools were above average on sixth grade ITBS. In Delaware, 100 percent of the districts that test in elementary level were above average in spite of the fact that Delaware tested special education students as well as regular students. In Rhode Island, thirty-four of thirty-eight districts were above average, twenty-three of twenty-four Maryland districts were above average, and all of New Hampshire's 155 districts tested above the national norm.

Some southern states with a high percentage of above average districts include South Carolina, Georgia, West Virginia, and Kentucky. In South Carolina, 68 percent of its districts test above average on fourth grade CTBS tests. Eighty-nine percent of Georgia's districts are above average on the second grade SAT. West Virginia claims that 98 percent of its districts are above average on the third grade CTBS, and 100 percent of Kentucky's 179 districts are above average on the third grade CTBS.

Friends for Education obtained results from a total of 3503 districts nationwide; 2857 or 82 percent claimed to be above average. Because one could not get much district information from northeastern and midwestern states, the data are mostly from southern states. If Friends for Education had the financial resources to obtain complete district results from wealthier states such as New York, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Kansas, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, Vermont, Maine, Illinois, and Indiana, it suspects the percentage of districts claiming to be above average in the United States would exceed 90 percent.

To confirm this suspicion, Friends for Education did a more detailed survey of one state. Michigan has an average per capita income, average college entrance scores, an average poverty rate, an average graduation rate, and other "average" characteristics ("State Education Statistics"), so the twenty largest districts in Michigan were surveyed as well as twenty additional districts selected at random (Table II). The survey showed that sixteen of the twenty largest Michigan school districts tested above average, and nineteen of twenty of the additional random sample were above average. In view of the results of this survey, it is estimated that more than 90 percent of the 525 Michigan school districts test above the national average on these tests.

Statistical analysis of these data (such as an average score for all the states or an average score for the different tests) would not be accurate because the data presented are in percentiles, which do not allow such statistical computations. But it is clear that the average student score exceeds the 60 percentile nationwide, instead of the 50 percentile represented as the national norm. Because the data do not include many wealthy states and because national percentile ranks are usually lower figures than percen-

tages of children above average, it is estimated that more than 70 percent of the children in the USA are being told they are above the national average!

State-by-state comparisons with these scores are of no value because different tests, different norms, and different reporting methods are used. CAT, SRA, and ITBS had the highest scores nationwide, but it is important to look at the states using the tests. Because of their high graduation rate and high college entrance scores ("State Education Statistics"), Maryland and New Hampshire would be expected to do well on the CAT (Maryland uses the older test), but North Carolina's scores are unexpectedly high. Iowa, Idaho, and North Dakota would likewise be expected to do well on ITBS, but the scores in Georgia are higher than expected. Oklahoma and Arkansas have very high scores on the MAT, a test found to be used, together with CAT and CTBS, in many southern and inner city districts.

These tests are designed, marketed, and normed by private companies like McGraw-Hill, which markets both CTBS and CAT; Harcourt Brace Jovonovich, which markets the MAT and the SAT; IBM, which markets the SRA; and Riverside Publishing, which markets the ITBS. At the time of publication, none of these companies would supply the data necessary for a proper statistical analysis of their test scores. They refused requests for the names of the states and districts using their tests (Friends for Education gathered that information on its own); they denied knowledge of the total number of children tested nationwide with their instrument, as well as the percentage of districts claiming to be above the national norm. They even denied knowledge of individual state and district results. One testing company (McGraw-Hill) threatened legal action against the author. One must remember that norm referenced testing is a 100 million dollar business in this country.

When yearly norms are not calculated (as with the tests under discussion), then current examinees are normed against a supposedly representative sample of students from the past called the norm group. The testing companies have calculated norms from this group, norms which are used year after year. The questions in these tests are the same year after year, and many school curricula are integrated with the test questions. Therefore, scores rise year after year in comparison to the norm group. This year-after-year rise in scores allows more than one half of the examinees and districts to be "above average" and can even allow those states with the lowest scores to claim to be above average. For example, West Virginia third graders recently had the lowest CTBS math scores of any third grade tested statewide in the USA. But all they were told was that they were above average with a 54 percentile (meaning they did better as a group than 54 percent of the 1981 norm group).

New tests are introduced the year [illegible] ing (Table IV). If the norm sample is representative and if the nor[illegible]g computations are accurate, then

one half of the children tested during the first year of use should fall above the 50th percentile and one half below the 50th percentile. **Instead, Friends for Education found that the state scores for all three recently renormed tests were well above average the very first year of use; this raises serious questions about the accuracy of the initial norms.**

The MAT6 was normed during 1984-85 school year and first used during the 1985-86 school year. Scores for the first year of MAT6 use were well above the 50 percentile for all states using the test. Two of these states (Arkansas and Oklahoma) rank low on standard barometers of excellence; nevertheless, they tested well above average the first year of MAT6 use. Likewise, CAT-E was introduced in 1985-86 and the scores for both states using the test (North Carolina and New Hampshire) were above the 55 percentile the first year of use. ITBS, Forms G&H, were first used in 1985-86, and all six states using the test were above average the first year (except grades 4-6 in Arizona). Even Georgia tested above average the first year of elementary ITBS-G use even though Georgia has the third lowest college entrance scores in the nation and the fourth lowest graduation rate ("State Education Statistics").

The highest scores and the most rapid improvement on these tests appear at elementary levels, not secondary levels. Questions to these tests change only every eight to ten years; thus, elementary teachers can easily teach the test because they administered it the year before. Furthermore, in states where steps have been taken to prevent the teaching of the tests, dramatic yearly gains are not found. Because of these differences between the yearly gains in states with test security measures and those without test security measures, it stands to reason that teachers may indeed be teaching the tests in those states with rapid yearly increases in scores.

To avoid the possibility of the teaching of tests, four states have taken elaborate security measures, and scores in these four states show only slight yearly increases. Utah tests only every three years and then with strict security (teachers do not administer the tests). Wisconsin tests only a sample of students, again with strict security. Both Utah and Wisconsin scores show only slight yearly increases, and scores are generally lower than scores from states where teaching the test is possible.

California and Maine administer a matrix sampling test with multiple different tests for the same grade in each subject area. This procedure prevents teaching the test, and in neither state does one find the dramatic yearly gains that are seen in most states.

Recently McGraw-Hill announced that it has developed and is making available a current-year norm for grades one through eight. It has obtained a sample of scores from schools using CTBS and CAT on an annual basis and has developed an estimate of a current national norm that will be updated every year. If the national sample from which it draws is accurate,

then only one half of the students and districts graded with current-year norms will test above the national average. Friends for Education sees no reason that other testing companies could not obtain scores and compute current yearly norms themselves. Friends for Education was able to obtain data from almost one third of the districts in the nation in spite of very limited resources. Certainly companies like McGraw-Hill, Harcourt Brace, and IBM could collect similar data.

A national achievement examination like The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) will address the accountability deficiencies that exist with the present mixture of commercial tests. If the NAEP examination is accurately normed and if the results are expressed in a uniform manner, then only 50 percent of children, districts, and states will be above average. If the test is given under strict security, not used for curriculum purposes and thus not teachable, then the only method that below-average states will have to improve scores will be to improve curriculum, attract better teachers with higher salaries, improve remediation programs, fire incompetent teachers and principals, buy textbooks that are more difficult, increase graduation requirements, and spend more money on education.

Above-average states would take similar steps to ensure that they remained above the norm. When all states can claim to be above average, such competitive pressures do not exist. School systems in West Virginia and across the nation find it easier to look good by using tests with inflated scores than by taking the more difficult steps required to truly improve a school system.

TABLE I

Twenty-six states test on a statewide basis with commercially available tests and all twenty-six test above average. In many of these states, local school districts administer an additional nationally normed test.

Six states administer a locally developed test on a statewide basis and all six test above average. These tests are nationally normed by an equating study with one of the major commercially available tests.

In sixteen states, the districts test independently and these states do not collect the district results. All sixteen of these states were found to be testing above average when their largest districts were surveyed (Table III). In two states (Indiana and Louisiana), the districts test independently, but the states have collected data. The majority of districts in these two states test above average.

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS:
Arizona
Colorado
Georgia
Idaho
Iowa
North Dakota

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST:
Alabama
Hawaii
Mississippi
Nevada
South Dakota
Tennessee

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS:
Delaware
Kentucky
New Mexico
South Carolina
Utah
West Virginia
Wisconsin

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
Maryland
New Hampshire
North Carolina

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST:
Arkansas
Oklahoma
Washington

SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES:
North Dakota
Virginia

LOCALLY DEVELOPED TEST:
California
Maine
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
Texas

STATES WHERE DISTRICTS TEST INDEPENDENTLY
Alaska
Connecticut
Florida
Illinois
Indiana
Kansas
Louisiana
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
New Jersey
New York
Ohio
Vermont
Wyoming

TABLE II

All data were twice sent to the State Departments of Education for verification and corrections. National percentile ranks were used for reporting whenever possible, but many states used alternative statistical reporting methods. The percentage of students testing above the 50 percentile was not available (N/A) from all states. The percentage of districts testing above average was gleaned from the state's publication when available.

Unless otherwise stated, the national norm is fifty. This study included only elementary grades one through six, except in the case of Idaho, where grade eight is the lowest grade tested.

ALABAMA
APRIL 1987

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM F NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	57,399	54	N/A	53	54	55	70.5%
2	52,146	51	N/A	63	56	57	78.3%
4	51,467	50	58	59	54	53	78.5%
5	48,471	48	55	60	52	50	58.5%

Mean Individual Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: Chief State School Officer's Report

ARKANSAS
SPRING 1987

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST
6th EDITION NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	29,491	60	63	67	64	65%	86.5%

National Percentile Rank from Mean Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: Arkansas Standardized Testing Program Report

ARIZONA
APRIL 1987

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM H NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	49,449	46	64	55	55	N/A	N/A
2	44,987	58	67	57	61	N/A	N/A
3	43,118	51	66	50	56	N/A	N/A
4	42,490	50	62	51	55	N/A	N/A
5	40,087	57	59	53	56	N/A	N/A
6	39,871	53	57	54	55	N/A	N/A

Percentage Of Children At Or Above 50th Percentile

*Number of Students Tested in Reading

SOURCE: Arizona Department of Education

CALIFORNIA
SPRING 1986

CALIFORNIA ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
(State Developed Test)
Scores Normed With CTBS/U NATIONAL NORMS
Matrix Sampling Technique 36 test forms for each grade level

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	310,008	55	51	63	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	287,478	54	54	66	N/A	N/A	N/A

Estimated National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: California Assessment Program Annual Report 1985-86

COLORADO
APRIL 1986

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average*	% of Districts Above Average
3	39,251	54	59	52	N/A	54.9%	77.5%
6	37,351	54	48	52	N/A	56.8%	69.7%

National Percentile Ranks
*In Reading

SOURCE: Results of the 1985-86 Colorado Student Testing Program

---

DELAWARE
APRIL 1986

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM V NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	N/A	52.6	N/A	58	N/A	N/A	100%
2	N/A	57	63.2	68.3	62.2	N/A	100%
3	N/A	55	66	63	63.3	N/A	100%
4	N/A	56	57.5	60.1	57.6	N/A	100%
5	N/A	52.7	57.4	61.7	56.1	N/A	100%
6	N/A	54.1	59.8	61.6	59	N/A	100%

Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: Delaware Educational Assessment Program 1986 Statewide Test Results Summary Report

---

GEORGIA
SPRING 1987

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
2	81,769	61	71	73	68	65.8%	89.8%
4	76,627	53	59	62	57	71.9%	67.2%

National Mean Percentile Scores

SOURCE: 1986-87 Student Assessment Test Summary

HAWAII
SPRING 1987

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM E-7th EDITION NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	12,500	77 (42)	81 (46)	81 (75)	81 (N/A)	N/A	N/A
6	11,500	77 (49)	78 (55)	79 (76)	80 (N/A)	N/A	N/A

Percentage of children average and above average (Stanine 4 or above)
National Group Percentile Ranks in parentheses

SOURCE: Administrator of Testing--Hawaii Department of Education

---

IDAHO
MARCH-APRIL 1986

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
8	14,072	57	55	55	54	59.5%	80.2%

National Percentile Rank

SOURCE: Coordinator for Guidance, Assessment and Evaluation
Idaho State Department of Education

INDIANA
1983p84 (Last Year Results Collected)

Various Nationally Normed Tests
ITBS Most Common

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language (Composition)	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
Primary	N/A	87.9	89	86.2	85.1	N/A	N/A

Scores Reported as Percentage of Students in Stanine 4 or Above
(All scores indicate above-average achievement)

SOURCE: School Achievement in Indiana

IOWA
1986-87

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G & H NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	% of Students Above Average	% of Iowa Schools Above Average
K	68	86
1	74	90
2	72	91
3	71	90
4	72	92
5	73	94
6	73	96

SOURCE: Score Reports and Norms - 1986-87

KENTUCKY
APRIL 1986

KENTUCKY ESSENTIAL SKILLS TEST
MODIFICATION OF CTBS - FORM U

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	53,527	52.6	N/A	65.9	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	47,337	54.4	51.8	71.3	57.8	64.1%	93.3%
3	45,855	60.8	69.3	59.3	66.1	79.6%	100%
4	43,035	58.2	56.4	59.2	57.5	61.9%	92.7%
5	42,400	53	60.8	59.5	56.5	60.1%	92.7%
6	40,403	56.8	54.6	62.3	58.1	64.1%	95.5%

Scores in Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: KEST Statewide Testing Results

MAINE — MAINE EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT (State Developed Test)
1985-86 — Matrix Sampling and Common Testing — 16 Different Tests

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Math	Social Studies	Science	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	14,012	+13.5	+6.9	+0.4	+2.2	N/A	N/A

Scores reported in terms of being above average in average percent correct

SOURCE: Maine Educational Assessment - 1985-86 State Summary and Interpretations Report

---

MARYLAND — CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FALL 1985 — FORM C — NATIONAL NORM

Grade	Number Tested	Reading Comprehension	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	37,458	3.6 (70)	3.8 (79)	3.5 (75)	N/A	N/A	95.8%
5	37,644	6.0 (83)	7.0 (98)	5.9 (90)	N/A	N/A	87.5%

Grade Equivalent Scale
National Percentile Rank in parentheses

SOURCE: Maryland Accountability Testing Program - Annual Report 1985-86

MISSISSIPPI — STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
APRIL 1987 — FORM E — STANFORD NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	43,560	53.2	N/A	49.9	51.7	N/A	N/A
4	37,017	47.9	52.0	50.7	49.5	N/A	N/A
6	33,477	46.6	51.7	50.7	49.1	N/A	N/A
					50.1 (Average)		

Mean National Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: Skills Analysis for Mississippi 1987 Results

NEVADA — STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
1985-86 — 7th EDITION — NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	10,000	93	94	93	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	10,000	90	89	90	N/A	N/A	N/A

The percentage of students who scored in Stanine 4 or Above
(Only information available)

SOURCE: The Nevada Proficiency Examination Program - Results of 1985/1986 Examinations

---

NEW HAMPSHIRE
OCTOBER 1986

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM E NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	11,381	65	61	61	62	62.7%	100%

Median National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: Highlights of Results - 1986

NEW MEXICO
MARCH 1987

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM U NATIONAL 1981 NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	20,862	50.2	55.8	58.4	57.1	60%	80.7%
5	19,139	54.0	56.0	62.3	55	59%	79.6%

National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: New Mexico Standardized Testing Program Report - 1985-86 School Year
New Mexico Department of Education

NORTH CAROLINA
SPRING 1987

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM E NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	86,050	57	53	71	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	80,946	53	60	69	62	N/A	88.7%
3	79,892	54	60	63	58	N/A	87.9%
6	80,413	50	56	59	55	N/A	79.4%

Median National Percentile

SOURCE: Report of Student Performance, Division of Research

NORTH DAKOTA

SEPTEMBER 1986

(Both SRA and ITBS Used in North Dakota)

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
2	214	77	83	71	77	N/A	N/A
3	2,774	67	65	60	65	N/A	N/A
4	694	69	66	59	64	N/A	N/A
5	2,008	68	64	64	66	N/A	N/A
6	603	68	67	63	67	N/A	N/A

Percentile Rank of Average Grade Equivalent

SEPTEMBER 1986

SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
FORM P NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	785	63	N/A	69	55	N/A	N/A
2	1,033	69	64	66	69	N/A	N/A
3	2,495	72	68	56	65	N/A	N/A
4	1,277	74	72	62	72	N/A	N/A
5	2,286	71	68	66	70	N/A	N/A
6	1,055	73	68	71	72	N/A	N/A

National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: Director of Testing, North Dakota - Department of Public Instruction

---

OKLAHOMA

FEBRUARY 1987

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST
6th EDITION NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	41,100	62	60	61	64	N/A	79%

National Percentile Rank of Mean Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: Oklahoma School Testing Program Summary Report - 1986

OREGON

FEBRUARY 1987

OREGON ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
(State Developed Test)
Equating Study with California Achievement Test
FORM E NATIONAL NORMS

Grade*	Number Tested**	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
8	4,513	58	N/A	49	N/A	N/A	N/A

National Percentile Rank

*Earliest Grade Tested

**Sample Of Students Tested

SOURCE: 1987 Eighth Grade Assessment of Reading, Mathematics and Writing Summary Report, July 1987

PENNSYLVANIA
MARCH 1987

TESTING FOR ESSENTIAL LEARNING AND LITERACY SKILLS (TELLS)
Equating Study with ITBS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	105,564	79.4*	N/A	84.6*	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	100,724	78.3*	N/A	81.6*	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mean Percent of Items Correct

*All scores are above the Estimated National Mean, but national norm is not 50 percentile

SOURCE: Testing for Essential Learning and Literacy Skills 1986-87 Statewide Test Results

---

RHODE ISLAND
SPRING 1986

RHODE ISLAND STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM Scores Normed with METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (MAT), Edition 6

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	8,310	64	64	59	63	63.9	94.7%
6	8,381	64	65	63	65	65.4	91.9%

Percentile Rank of Average Scores

SOURCE: Rhode Island State Assessment Program 1985-86 Basic Skills, Health Knowledge and Physical Fitness Testing Results

---

SOUTH CAROLINA
MARCH 1987

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS FORM U NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	44,946	56.1	64.3	67.6	61.2	62.9%	82.4%
5	42,831	50.9	59.4	64.2	54.4	54.5%	52.8%

Median National Percentile Scores

SOURCE: Preliminary Report of the 1987 Statewide Testing Program

---

SOUTH DAKOTA
APRIL 1987

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST FORM F NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	9,562	58.8 (85)	59.7 (90)	60.1 (91)	57.9	72%	N/A

Normal Curve Equivalents
National Percentile Ranks in parentheses

SOURCE: Skills Analysis for South Dakota State

TENNESSEE
SPRING 1987

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
7th EDITION NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
2	62,456	64	86	86	N/A	N/A	82.9%
5	57,717	52	66	68	N/A	N/A	61.9%

Group Percentile Rank of the Mean Scaled Scores

SOURCE: Tennessee Test Results - 1986-87

TEXAS
FEBRUARY 1986

TEXAS EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF MINIMUM SKILLS Equated with Metropolitan Achievement Test 6th Edition

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Writing	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	268,656	62	66	70	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	236,592	47	61	62	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	225,601	53	63	62	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Student Performance Results for 1985 and 1986

UTAH
APRIL 1984

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM U NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested*	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
5	4,500	59	55	65	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Sample of students tested

Utah administers the test to students under strict security (no regular teachers administer the test)

SOURCE: Utah Statewide Educational Assessment General Report 1984

VIRGINIA
SPRING 1987

SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES TEST
LEVEL E - FORM 1 NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	67,567	58	62	61	N/A	N/A	60.5%

National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: Virginia State Assessment Program 1986-87

WASHINGTON
OCTOBER 1986

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST
6th EDITION
NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	52,779	56	52	53	56	N/A	65.1%

Median National Percentile Rank

SOURCE: Washington Statewide Assessment Grades 4, 8, 10-Fall 1986

WEST VIRGINIA
MARCH 1987

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM U
NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	23,961	61	72	54	65	69.2%	98.2%
6	23,371	58	62	66	62	64.5%	92.7%

Mean Percentile Scores

SOURCE: Coordinator, West Virginia State-County Testing Program

---

WISCONSIN
FEBRUARY-MARCH 1986

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM U
NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	1,500*	68	63	63	N/A	N/A	N/A

Median National Percentile Rank

*Sample Of Students Tested

SOURCE: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

TABLE III

In sixteen states, the State Departments of Education had no knowledge of individual district results. The largest districts in those sixteen states were surveyed by telephone and asked if their elementary (1-6) total basic battery scores were above, at, or below the national average. In most cases all scores at all grade levels were above the stated national norm. If some grade levels tested below and others tested above, then above average was defined as an average normal curve equivalent for the six grades that exceeded fifty, or four of the six grades exceeding the stated national norm in total basic skills. If the total basic skills or basic battery scores were not available, then scores for reading, language, and math were used.

In ten of these states, all districts surveyed were above average. In four states, one district was below average, one state had two districts below average and one state (Ohio) had three districts below average (but ten above average). Of the 167 largest districts surveyed by telephone, 150 were above average (90 percent), thirteen were below average and four districts refused to release the information.

Twenty additional districts in one state (Michigan) were randomly selected from the state directory and surveyed by telephone. Ninety-five percent (19 of 20) of these randomly selected districts were above average.

ALASKA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Anchorage	ITBS	"Above Average"
Fairbanks	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
MATSU	SRA	"Above Average"
Kenai Peninsula	SRA	"Above Average"
Juneau	SRA	"Above Average"
Ketchikan	SRA	"Above Average"
Kodiak	ITBS	"Above Average"

CONNECTICUT

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Hartford	MAT	"Above Average"
Bridgeport	MAT 6	"Above Average"
New Haven	MAT 6	"Above Average"
Waterbury	ITBS-H	Refused
Stamford	STEP	"Above Average"
Norwalk	CTBS	"Above Average"
Danbury	ITBS	"Above Average"
Bristol	SAT	"Above Average"
Meriden	ITBS	"Above Average"
Greenwich	SAT	"Above Average"
Britain	SAT	Refused
Enfield	CAT	"Above Average"

FLORIDA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Dade County	SAT-E/F	"Below Average"
Broward County	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Hillsboro County	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Duval County	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Pinellas County	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Palm Beach County	SAT	"Above Average"
Orange County	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Polk County	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Brevard County	CTBS-U/V	"Above Average"
Seminole County	CTBS-U/V	"Above Average"
Lee County	CAT-C	"Above Average"

ILLINOIS

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Chicago	ITBS-7	"Below Average"
Rockford	NTBS-85	"Above Average"
Elgian Unit	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
East St. Louis	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Peoria	SRA	"Above Average"
Springfield	CAT-E/F	"Above Average"
Schaumberg	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Decatur	SRA-P	"Above Average"
Valley View	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Waukegan	CAT-E/F	"Below Average"
Dundee	SAT-82	"Above Average"

KANSAS

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Wichita	ITBS	"Above Average"
Shawnee-Mission	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Kansas City	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Topeka	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Olathe	ITBS	"Above Average"
Junction City	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Manhatten	ITBS-85	"Above Average"
Garden City	SRA-85	"Above Average"
Emporia	SRA-85	"Above Average"

LOUISIANA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
# 1	CTBS	"Above Average"
# 2	CTBS	"Below Average"
# 3	CAT	"Above Average"
# 4	SAT	"Above Average"
# 5	SRA	"Above Average"
# 6	CAT	"Above Average"
# 7	SRA	"Above Average"

Results obtained directly from the Louisiana Department of Education. Names of the Districts were not released.

MASSACHUSETTS

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Boston	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Springfield	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Worcester	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Brockton	CAT	"Above Average"
New Bedford	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Fall River	MAT-5	"Above Average"
Lynn	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Newton	STEP	"Above Average"
Quincy	CTBS	"Above Average"
Cambridge	SAT-7	"Above Average"

MICHIGAN

20 Largest Districts:

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Detroit	CAT-E	"Below Average"
Flint	ITBS	"Below Average"
Grand Rapids	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Lansing	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Utica	ITBS	"Above Average"
Wayne Westland	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Pontiac	CAT-E	"Below Average"
Warren	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Saginaw	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Livonia	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Plymouth Canton	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Taylor	CTBS-U	Refused
Ann Arbor	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Port Huron	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Waterford	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Dearborn	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Bay City	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Troy	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Jenison	SAT	"Above Average"
Three Rivers	ITBS	"Below Average"

20 Randomly Selected Districts:

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Hopkins	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Niles	SAT	"Above Average"
Pennfield	ITBS	"Above Average"
Big Bay De Noc	SAT-E/F	"Above Average"
Littlefield	SAT-E	"Above Average"
Westwood Heights	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Vandercook Lake	ITBS	"Above Average"
Schoolcraft	SRA	"Above Average"
Brandon	CTBS-TCS/U	"Above Average"
Wyandotte City	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Walkerville Rural	ITBS	"Below Average"
Vestaburg	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Big Rapids	MAT-6	"Above Average"
St. Ignace Area	SRA	"Above Average"
Delton Kellogg	CAT/SAT	"Above Average"
Beaverton Rural	CTBS	"Above Average"
Highland Park	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Battle Creek	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Byron Center	ITBS-7&8	"Above Average"
Nice	SAT	"Above Average"

MINNESOTA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Minneapolis	SAT	"Above Average"
	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Anoka	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
St. Paul	SRA	"Above Average"
Osseo	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Rosemount	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Bloomington	SAT-82	"Above Average"
Moundsview	CTBS-U/V	"Above Average"
St. Cloud	CTBS-81	"Above Average"

MISSOURI

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
St. Louis	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Kansas City	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Springfield	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Parkway	SRA	"Above Average"
Hazelwood	SRA	"Above Average"
North Kansas	ITBS-7/8	"Above Average"
St. Joseph	SRA	"Above Average"
Columbia	ITBS-86	"Above Average"
Francis Howell	CTBS-81	"Above Average"
Mehlville	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Blue Springs	ITBS-82	"Above Average"
Fox	CAT-C/D-85	"Above Average"

MONTANA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Billings	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Great Falls	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Helena	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Butte	SAT-E	"Above Average"
Missoula	ITBS-7	"Above Average"

NEBRASKA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Omaha	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Lincoln	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Millard	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Bellevue	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Grand Island	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Papillion-La Vista	CAT-E/F	"Above Average"
Westside	CTBS	"Above Average"
South Sioux City	SRA	"Above Average"

NEW JERSEY

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Newark	CTBS-U	"Below Average"
Jersey City	CAT-E	Refused
Patterson	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Camden	CTBS	Refused
Toms River	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Elizabeth	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Trenton	CAT-C	"Above Average"
East Orange	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Hamilton Township	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Cherry Hill Township	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Bayonne City	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Allendale	CAT-E	"Above Average"

NEW YORK

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
New York City	MAT-6/DRP	"Above Average"
Buffalo	SAT-N	"Above Average"
Rochester	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Syracuse	SRA	"Above Average"
Yonkers	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Sachem	SAT	"Above Average"
Middle Country	SAT-81	"Above Average"
Greece	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Spring Valley	ITBS	"Above Average"

OHIO

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Cleveland	CTBS	"Below Average"
Columbus	CTBS-U/V	"Above Average"
Cincinnati	CAT-C/D	"Above Average"
Toledo	ITBS	"Above Average"
Akron	CAT-C	"Above Average"
So. Western City	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Youngstown City	SAT-7	"Below Average"
Canton	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Loraine City	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Springfield City	ITBS-G	"Below Average"
Westerville City	ITBS	"Above Average"
Elyria City	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Warren	MAT-6	"Above Average"

VERMONT

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
# 1	SAT-7	"Above Average"
# 2	SAT-7	"Below Average"
# 3	SAT-7&6	"Above Average"
# 4	CAT-E	"Above Average"
# 5	MAT-6	"Above Average"
# 9	SAT-7	"Above Average"

WYOMING

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Laramie	SRA	"Above Average"
Natrona	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Campbell	ITBS	"Above Average"
Sweetwater # 1	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Albany	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Sheridan # 2	SRA	"Above Average"
Vinta	SRA	"Above Average"

TABLE IV

Table IV includes the scores for the first year of use of three recently renormed achievement tests. If the norms used are accurate initially, Friends for Education thought that the scores for the first year of use should approximate the stated national norm of 50 percentile (some states above fifty and some below). Instead, all states were above average at all elementary grade levels tested except for three grades in Arizona. Even Georgia, North Carolina, Arkansas and Oklahoma tested above average in the first year of use.

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS - FORMS G/H
RENORMED 1984-85
FIRST USED 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR

STATE	DATE ADMINISTERED	GRADES TESTED	RESULTS (Percentile Rank For Total Battery)
Arizona	Fall 1986	1 through 6	1-3 Above Average (N/A) 4-6 Below Average (N/A)
Colorado	Spring 1986	3;6	Above Average (54;54)
Georgia	Spring 1986	2;4	Above Average (60;52)
Idaho	Spring 1986	8	Above Average (54)
Iowa	1985-86	K through 6	Above Average (N/A)
North Dakota	Fall 1985	3;5	Above Average (74;75)

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST - FORM E
RENORMED 1984-85
FIRST USED 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR

STATE	DATE ADMINISTERED	GRADES TESTED	RESULTS (Percentile Rank For Total Battery)
New Hampshire	October 1985	4	Above Average (55.6)
North Carolina	Spring 1986	2;3;6	Above Average (57;57;53)

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST
6TH EDITION -- RENORMED 1984-85
FIRST USED 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR

STATE	DATE ADMINISTERED	GRADES TESTED	RESULTS (Percentile Rank For Total Battery)
Arkansas	Spring 1986	4	Above Average (64)
Oklahoma	Spring 1986	3	Above Average (59)
Washington	Fall 1985	4	Above Average (55)

WORK CITED

"State Education Statistics Supplement Student Performance and Resource Inputs 1985-1986." Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, February 1987.

"Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics, 1987." Thomas D. Snyder, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. U. S. Department of Education.

Additional sources for the state data are listed in Table II.

A5030-1U 5/88

NATIONALLY NORMED ELEMENTARY ACHIEVEMENT TESTING IN AMERICA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HOW ALL FIFTY STATES ARE ABOVE THE NATIONAL AVERAGE

JOHN JACOB CANNELL
FRIENDS FOR EDUCATION

Working For Accountability
in Public Education

SECOND EDITION

Thanks to Malinda Thacker, Tammy Quesenberry, John Casto, Tammy Powers, Thomas Kinraide, Beverly Kinraide, and Anita Lilly for their many long hours collecting data and revising manuscripts. Also, thanks to Dr. Charles Yeargin and Dr. Bruce Hall for their suggestions and criticisms. Special thanks to my wife, Ina, whose patience and encouragement were invaluable.

My thanks also to Esalen Institute in Big Sur, California, where this project was conceived and where I found the energy for its completion.

John Jacob Cannell, M.D., is a physician studying psychiatry at the University of New Mexico. He is President of Friends For Education, a non-profit, citizen group interested in accountability in public education.

Additional copies of this report are available for $10.00 from Friends For Education, Box 358, Daniels, West Virginia 25832-0358.

Second Edition
Copyright © 1987 by Friends For Education
All rights reserved.

NATIONALLY NORMED ELEMENTARY ACHIEVEMENT TESTING IN AMERICA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HOW ALL FIFTY STATES ARE ABOVE THE NATIONAL AVERAGE

by
John Jacob Cannell
FRIENDS FOR EDUCATION

SECOND EDITION

American elementary schools have only one method of comparing local school achievement to national achievement. Secondary schools use graduation rates, college entrance scores, dropout rates, and commercial achievement tests as their report cards; elementary schools rely exclusively on nationally normed, norm-referenced achievement tests sold to them by commercial publishers like McGraw-Hill and Harcourt Brace. These tests tell parents, teachers, and administrators if student achievement is above or below the national norm and if average school achievement is improving or worsening.

These tests are used by nearly every school district in the nation, including all 55 districts in West Virginia. The most recent scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) ranked West Virginia's third graders at the 65th percentile and sixth graders at the 62nd percentile, compared to the 50th percentile which is the "national norm" supplied by the publishers. "How much improvement is needed? We are already above the average" is a point frequently made by the elementary educators.

In contrast, the United States Department of Education reports that West Virginia has the highest percentage of adults without a college education, the second lowest per capita income, and the third lowest college entrance scores (ACT) in the nation ("State Education Statistics"). Few deny the problems in West Virginia's public schools.

How could West Virginia do so poorly on every other indicator of student performance but consistently test above the 50th percentile on the nationally normed, commercially available CTBS test? If West Virginia is above average, what state is below average?

Friends for Education surveyed all 50 states and discovered that **no state scores below the publisher's "national norm"** at the elementary level on any of the six major nationally normed, commercially available tests. A few states had one or two elementary grade levels or an occasional subject that was below average, but most states had all subject areas and all elementary grade levels well above the publisher's "national norm" of the 50th percentile.

Friends for Education sent letters to the superintendents and testing coordinators of all 50 states. Forty-three responded within one month, and the remaining seven responded to a second letter. Information obtained included the name of the test used (Table I), the norms used, the dates of administration, the statistical method used to report the scores, the number of students tested, and the reading, language, math, and basic battery scores. Some states also supplied the percentage of students testing above average at each grade level as well as the number and percentage of districts testing above average.

The states reported data using many different statistical reporting methods, such as national percentile rank, normal curve equivalent, grade equivalent scores, and others. Friends for Education reprinted the scores as received from the states and did not perform any additional statistical operations on the data.

Friends for Education found that these standardized, nationally normed achievement tests give children, parents, school systems, legislatures, and the press inflated and misleading reports on achievement levels. The tests – Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), California Achievement Test (CAT), Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), and Science Research Associates (SRA)– **allow 90 percent of the school districts in the United States to be above average.**

Thirty-two states test elementary children on a statewide basis, and all 32 are testing above the national norm (Table II). Many of these states rank below the national average on standard barometers of excellence, such as per capita income, graduation rates, performance on college entrance examinations, and statewide literacy rates ("State Education Statistics"). Such states include Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas – all of which are testing well above the publisher's "national norm" on elementary achievement.

The majority of elementary children in all these states are told they are above average. For example, 72 percent of Georgia's fourth

graders tested above the publisher's national norm on the ITBS; 79.6 percent of Kentucky's third graders tested above the norm on the CTBS; and Tennessee's second graders had a national group percentile rank of 86 percent in mathematics and language on the SAT (in spite of the fact that Tennessee has the ninth lowest graduation rate and the third lowest college entrance scores in the nation).

In the remaining eighteen states, local districts administer the tests, but without statewide control (Table III). Most of these states denied knowledge of individual district results, so Friends for Education telephoned the largest school districts in each of these states and asked if elementary scores were "above or below the national average"; all eighteen states had a majority of the surveyed districts above the national average. These larger districts often include metropolitan areas with many inner city children, a group often thought to be below the norm. Instead, most inner-city districts were claiming to be above average, including Trenton and East Orange, NJ; New York, NY; Boston and Springfield, MA; St. Louis and Kansas City, MO; East St. Louis, IL; and Grand Rapids, MI.

The eighteen states where the districts test independently are mostly northeastern and midwestern states that generally rank high on standard barometers of excellence. Friends for Education feels certain, after sampling their largest districts, that virtually all the districts in such states are testing above the norm. This finding is not surprising; if poor southern states have a majority of districts above average, then wealthier states should have all but their inner city districts above average on the same tests. For example, all of Delaware's districts tested above average in spite of the fact that Delaware included special education students as well as regular students. In Rhode Island all 38 districts (except two inner-city districts) were above average. All of Maryland's 24 districts (except Baltimore City) were above average; and all of New Hampshire's 155 districts tested above the national norm.

Friends for Education obtained results from a total of 3503 districts nationwide; 2,857 or 82 percent tested above average. Because few northeastern and midwestern states test on a statewide basis, these data are mostly from southern states. Friends for Education does not have the financial resources to obtain complete district results from states such as New York, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Kansas, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, Vermont, Maine, Illinois, and Indiana, all of which test independently and all of which rank high on standard barometers of excellence. If complete district results from wealthier states were included, the percentage of elementary school districts testing above the national average in the United States would exceed 90 percent.

To confirm this suspicion, Friends for Education did a more detailed survey of one average state. Michigan has an average per capita income, average college entrance scores, an average poverty rate, an average graduation rate, and other "average" characteristics ("State Education Statistics"), so the twenty largest districts in Michigan were surveyed as well as twenty additional districts selected at random (Table II). The survey showed that sixteen of the twenty largest Michigan school districts tested above average, and nineteen of twenty of the additional random sample were above average. This confirmed our impression that 90 percent of American school districts are testing above the publisher's "national norm."

State-by-state comparisons with these scores are of no value because different tests, different norms, and different reporting methods are used. CAT, SRA, and ITBS had the highest scores nationwide, but it is important to look at the states using the tests. Because of their high graduation rates and high college entrance scores ("State Education Statistics"), Maryland and New Hampshire would be expected to do well on the CAT (Maryland uses the older test), but North Carolina's scores are unexpectedly high. Iowa, Idaho, and North Dakota would likewise be expected to do well on ITBS, but the scores in Georgia are higher than expected. Oklahoma and Arkansas have unbelievably high scores on the MAT, a test found to be used, together with CAT and CTBS, in many southern and inner-city districts.

These tests are designed, marketed, and normed by unregulated and unsupervised private companies like McGraw-Hill, which markets both CTBS and CAT; Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, which markets the MAT and the SAT; IBM, which markets the SRA; and Houghton-Mifflin, which markets the ITBS. At the time of publication, none of these companies would supply the data necessary for a proper statistical analysis of their test scores. They refused requests for the names of the states and districts using their tests (Friends for Education gathered that information on its own); they denied knowledge of the total number of children tested nationwide with their instrument, as well as the percentage of districts claiming to be above the national norm. They even denied knowledge of individual state and district results. One testing company (McGraw-Hill) threatened legal action against the author. One must remember that norm-referenced testing is a 100 million dollar business in this country.

Standard principles of mathematics make it difficult for more than one half of our children to be above average. However, these tests do not use current students for comparison, but rather use a "norm group" from the past for comparison, so it is statistically possible for 100 percent of current students to be above average, a point seldom explained by the publishers. Most testing companies renorm the test every eight

to ten years; as a result, current student achievement is being compared to old norms. **Test publishers claim that the high scores reflect outdated norms caused by improved achievement, However, we believe inaccurate initial norms are the reason for high scores and integration of unchanging test questions into the curriculum is the reason for steadily improving scores.**

Current averages are not calculated with these tests. Instead, current examinees are compared to a supposedly representative sample of students tested in the past called the "norm group." The testing companies select this norm group. The norm group includes special education students, and the norm group does not receive any special test preparation. Current students study the test questions, which have been integrated into their curriculum, and current special education students are usually excluded from testing. This ensures that even those states with the lowest scores can test above the norm. For example, West Virginia third graders recently had the lowest CTBS math scores of any third grade tested statewide in the USA, but all they were told was that they were above average with a 54th percentile (meaning they did better than 54 percent of the unprepared and more inclusive 1981 norm group).

New tests are introduced the year after norming (Table IV). If the norm sample is representative and if the norming computations are accurate, then only half of the children tested during the first year of use should fall above the 50th percentile. Instead, the majority of children in all states tested well above average the first year they used one of three recently renormed tests. **This fact brings into question the accuracy of the initial norms.**

The MAT6 was normed during the 1984-85 school year and first used during the 1985-86 school year (Table IV). Scores for the first year of MAT6 use were well above the 50th percentile for all states using the test. Two of these states (Arkansas and Oklahoma) rank low on standard barometers of excellence; nevertheless, they both tested in the 60th percentile the first year of MAT6 use. Likewise, CAT-E was introduced in 1985-86, and the scores for both states using the test (North Carolina and New Hampshire) were above the 55th percentile the first year of use. ITBS, Forms G & H, were first used in 1985-86, and all six states using the test were above average the first year (except grades 4-6 in Arizona). Even Georgia tested above average the first year of elementary ITBS-G use although Georgia has the third lowest college entrance scores and [illegible] lowest graduation rate in the nation ("State Education Statistics").

By testing a norm group that has not received any special test preparation, and that includes larger numbers of special education children than will be tested in practice, the publishers can market tests

which allow all states to be above the "national norm." However, very low achieving inner city and poor school districts may still test below average, so publishers also sell "low socioeconomic norms" and "large city norms" (Riverside Test Resource Catalog, 1987); both will raise scores, often "above the norm."

Publishers contend Friends for Education has mistakenly equated "average," "median," and "norm." However, it is the school administrators, parents, and test publishers who interchange the three. In fact, common English usage does equate average and norm *(Webster's Third New International Dictionary).*

Most state publications imply that "above the national norm" means "above the national average." Delaware's publication states that "Average Delaware student performance was above the national average at all grade levels. Average scores higher than 50 are above the national norm." South Carolina's publication states, "The achievement levels of the 4th, 5th and 7th graders were above the national median in all seven areas tested in 1987." Many states had impressive graphs with their achievement towering above national achievement. However, no state publication honestly described norm-referenced testing.

State Education Department press releases often imply that average and norm are the same. A 1987 West Virginia "Quick Facts" press release displayed grade-by-grade, above-average test scores with an explanation that "national average equals 50." A June 16, 1987, New Mexico press release stated scores "are above the national average, which is the 50th percentile."

When Friends for Education surveyed the districts by telephone we purposely asked if they were "above the national average." Only three of 180 districts bothered to correct us by replying "above the national norm group."

In fact test publishers sell narrative, personal and group report forms that explain or imply that above the norm is the same as above average. The 1988 SRA catalog offers a Narrative Report for explaining norm-referenced test scores to parents; it explains how their child's "scores fall in relation to below average, average, or above average." SRA's Report of Average Scores asks teachers "How does your classroom compare with the national average?" and then lists the norm-referenced test scores for that class. The 1987 Riverside Test Resource Catalog sells similar explanatory aids. Their Pupil Profile Narrative (8-81326) tells parents that "overall achievement appears to be above average." The CAT parent report (I-131-PR) is more direct: "The national average for each test would be considered a percentile rank of 50."

Publishers and school officials claim scores have improved because student achievement has improved, thus outdating the norms. However, other indicators of American school quality are not as optimis-

tic. "A Nation At Risk" warned about decreasing achievement in America's public schools. College Board scores have declined 3 percent over the last 15 years (937 in 1972; 906 In 1986). The graduation rate has fallen from 77.2 percent in 1972 to 70.6 percent in 1986 ("State Education Statistics"). Our nation continues to do poorly on international achievement comparisons. The verbal composite of the Armed Forces Vocational Aptitude Battery was normed in 1980 with an average of 50, by 1986 the verbal composite had fallen 7 percent, to 46.4 (private communication, Department of Defense, September, 1987). The 1985 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reported that 40 percent of young Americans educated within the last 15 years, could not read a map, use an almanac, or balance their checkbook. The figure was 80 percent for young black Americans.

However, all the school districts Friends for Education surveyed had improved over time on the commercial achievement tests, often every year. We could not identify any district in the USA that is declining in elementary achievement on the commercial tests, provided the district is not already performing at maximum levels and provided the district reuses the same test questions, which almost all do. Even the cities and states with the reputations for the worst schools in the nation (Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland; Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia) claim steady improvement on these tests, usually every year.

The commercial achievement tests are also administered in secondary schools, but publishers admit there has not been any significant secondary improvement over the last fifteen years. **How could overall achievement improve dramatically in elementary school but not eventually be evident in secondary school?** Friends for Education believes the elementary "improvements" result from extensive integration of unchanging test questions into the elementary curriculum, not from improvements in overall achievement.

Curriculum integration, which is uncommon in secondary school, attempts to guarantee that tested skills will receive classroom emphasis. Teachers administer these tests every year, and most publishers encourage the examiners to "become familiar with test content by taking the test" (instructions in the CTBS Examiner's Manual). However, even if the teachers refuse to look at the test booklets, curriculum supervisors are very familiar with the actual test question, and frequently use actual test questions as examples in teacher conferences. If the questions are not rotated, scores will go up. **In the three states that rotate equivalent test questions in some manner, no improvements occurred last year. However, all of the states that use commercial tests without rotating questions reported improved elementary test scores last year.**

California and Maine have developed matrix sample tests with multiple forms for the same grade level. Wisconsin tests only a sample of children every year, always from different schools. Both of these methods discourage test-item teaching, and none of these three states reported improvements last year in elementary achievement, the only statewide assessments not to do so.

If test-item teaching is widespread, then changing test questions will result in embarrassing drops in test scores. The new questions will not have been emphasized, and scores will fall unless the new test is much easier. Precipitous drops were common, especially in inner-city and poor school districts. Such overnight achievement declines can be damaging politically, so old tests are frequently used for a decade or more. For example, Cincinnati, Akron, St. Louis, Trenton, and Maryland all use the ten-year-old California Achievement Test. If such districts switch to an equivalent test, scores should fall in direct proportion to the extent of test teaching. In 1986, Washington, D.C., switched from the seventeen-year-old CTBS S/T to the five-year-old CTBS, U/V, and elementary scores dropped by 20 percentile points.

The biennial NAEP reading assessment had shown a slight increase in elementary achievement until 1980 when it flattened until 1986. The 1986 assessment indicated a precipitous decline in American reading proficiency at ages nine and seventeen. The drop was so steep, NAEP could not "believe that declines of this magnitude over a two year period could have gone unnoticed by educators" ("The NAEP 1985-86 Reading Anomaly.") They also stated the "declines were not evident in individual state assessment that would have been expected to move in parallel with national results." ("Who reads best?, The Nation's Report Card.") As a result, the 1986 reading assessment was labeled "anomalous," and NAEP decided to wait for the 1988 assessment before making any comparisons. When one realizes that the state assessments use the commercial tests and that teachers rely on commercial tests to measure class achievement, then an undetected drop would not be surprising, especially if recent editions of the commercial tests have been quietly "dumbed down" by the publishers.

Recently, drops in scores when tests are changed have not been as noticeable as they were in earlier years. West Virginia switched to the newer CTBS in 1984 without a significant drop in scores, despite widespread teaching of test items from the older exams. Arkansas switched from the 1978 SRA to the 1985 MAT6, and elementary scores actually increased. Friends for Education analyzed old and new editions of a Level 13 CAT, using a Frye's Readability Index (Table V). It showed a full grade level drop in difficulty on the expository reading passages of the new test (126 syllables and 11 sentences per 100 words on the 1985 test and 132 syllables and 10 sentences per 100 words on the

1978 test). Similar analysis of an Intermediate Level I Stanford showed a two grade level drop in reading difficulty on the new test (132 syllables and 7.5 sentences per 100 words on the 1982 test, compared to 140 syllables and 4.6 sentences per 100 words on the 1972 test). Detailed analyses of new and old editions-comparing reading level, norms, and question difficulty-need to be done by testing experts, which Friends for Education are not. **Such analyses should be done on a routine basis by the US Department of Education, whose lack of knowledge of these tests constitutes nonfeasance.**

Obviously there are many factors that are contributing to the misleading impression of high and improving achievement in the nation's elementary schools, and steps must be taken to correct all the problems. First there is clearly a need for yearly rotation of equivalent but different test questions. Achievement tests must use a random sampling of student achievement to estimate overall student achievement; curriculum integration of unchanging test questions destroys such randomness. Publishers have a responsibility to see that their tests are accurate during development, norming, administration, and in public representation, as do the publishers of college entrance exams. The questions should be randomly selected from the desired base curriculum; the entire base curriculum should be available to all who desire to see it, but the pool of questions should remain under the strict security of the publishers, and actual questions should never be used twice.

Most publishers now plan to make current year norms available, but current year averages from all the test takers, as on The College Board and ACT, are needed. Current averages from all test takers would eliminate the need to test a norm group, which many publishers find difficult to do. It would also ensure that only half of the districts test above average every year, a distinction that 90 percent of them now enjoy. The publishers could easily ground achievement levels in the past, as the college entrance tests are grounded, so that improvement as well as current ranking could be documented.

Test publishers should stop paying "consultant fees" to university or public educators who too often are mere sycophants, giving the commercial interests what they want. Research grants for legitimate purposes should be awarded competitively and openly when the need exists. The fact that 90 percent of the districts in America are testing "above the norm" makes one wonder if any "consultants" failed to question the accuracy of the norms. The integration of curriculum with unchanging test questions guarantees improvements in test scores, regardless of school improvements, and should have drawn objections from the education community. A detailed analysis of new test editions for "dumbing down" should be done routinely by psychometricians who are not associated with the testing industry.

An Honesty in Testing Service needs to be created. The cost would be minimal; the U.S. Department of Education could easily fund such an agency or service by competitive applications. Such a service would publish annual reports such as this report but use more detailed sampling methods, methods that would allow the computation of accurate current year norms for all major tests. Such a service could also compare relative difficulty of the major tests and analyze new tests for "dumbing down." It would have the effect of keeping the testing industry honest, as well as serving as a resource for psychometricians and educators.

These tests are often accused of being racist because average black children score lower than average white children. The tests contain very basic reading, math, and language questions that any elementary child needs to know, regardless of race. It is the appearance of high scores that allows inner-city schools to continue producing functionally illiterate black students. Accurate achievement testing would force school administrators and politicians to face the politically embarrassing fact that black children finish American elementary schools with fewer basic skills than white children.

In addition to our questions about test validity, Friends for Education has other concerns. We wonder whether too much testing is currently done in American Public Schools; one accurate test should suffice. We are also concerned about the wisdom of labeling children as above or below average in early elementary school. However, **if** it is to be done, we insist that it be done honestly. Telling children, parents, schools, and school systems that they are above average when they are not is unethical. In addition, it leads to a dangerous smugness in school bureaucracy, a complacency that effectively resists needed school reforms. Inflated scores also falsely reassure parents, lessening their interest in school reform.

These tests were used as accountability measures only after newspapers obtained and printed the scores under Freedom of Information suits. Because these tests allow more than one half of examinees to be above average, because scores can be raised by teaching the unchanging test questions, and because most state test security is inadequate, these tests are completely inadequate as measures for accountability in their present form. The clamor for accountability in education will grow as NAEP reading scores plummet, so commercial tests must be modified by the publishers to serve their current and future role in making American education more accountable. Until that time, only College entrance scores, which have none of the above problems (but other problems), and NAEP scores can be used for comparisons with national achievement.

Publishers themselves have encouraged educators to use these tests for accountability and public relations purposes; most school districts do just that. The ITBS Manual for School Administrators states: "The detailed, objective reporting of test results also has considerable public relations values, particularly when schools are being criticized for allegedly neglecting the basic skills." Such advice has been heeded in Chicago, for example, whose schools were recently labeled as the "worst in the nation" by Secretary of Education Bennett. This year Chicago public school officials have again produced steadily rising elementary scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, scores which are approaching the 50th percentile.

If instead of these inflated scores, Chicago school officials and politicians had to report that Chicago school children test in the 10th percentile and that achievement in Chicago schools is not improving, we can only guess at the internal reforms such news might cause.

The commercial publishers could easily supply accurate tests, which are averaged every year and which rotate equivalent but different test questions. If the tests are secure, if the actual questions are rotated and are not integrated into the curriculum, and if the degree of difficulty remains the same from year to year (all qualities of the College Entrance Tests), then the only avenue that schools would have to improve test scores would be to improve schools.

Unlike secondary schools, elementary schools have only these commercial achievement tests to compare local achievement to national achievement. This explains the relative importance these tests have in elementary schools, and it also explains the frustration many elementary teachers feel when their schools are criticized. Teachers must depend on these tests to give accurate reports on national achievement rankings and improvements for their students, classes, and schools. The vast majority of American elementary teachers are currently told their class is performing above the national average, and virtually all educators are told that school achievement is improving. How can we ask American elementary educators to improve on such a record?

TABLE I

Twenty-six states test on a statewide basis with commercially available tests and all twenty-six test above average. In many of these states, local school districts administer an additional nationally normed test.

Six states administer a locally developed test on a statewide basis and all six test above average. These tests are nationally normed by an equating study with one of the major commercially available tests.

In sixteen states, the districts test independently and these states do not collect the district results. All sixteen of these states were found to be testing above average when their largest districts were surveyed (Table III). In two states (Indiana and Louisiana), the districts test independently, but the states have collected data. The majority of districts in these two states test above average.

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS:
Arizona
Colorado
Georgia
Idaho
Iowa
North Dakota

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST:
Alabama
Hawaii
Mississippi
Nevada
South Dakota
Tennessee

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS:
Delaware
Kentucky
New Mexico
South Carolina
Utah
West Virginia
Wisconsin

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
Maryland
New Hampshire
North Carolina

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST:
Arkansas
Oklahoma
Washington

SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES:
North Dakota
Virginia

LOCALLY DEVELOPED TEST:
California
Maine
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
Texas

STATES WHERE DISTRICTS TEST INDEPENDENTLY
Alaska
Connecticut
Florida
Illinois
Indiana
Kansas
Louisiana
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
New Jersey
New York
Ohio
Vermont
Wyoming

TABLE II

All data were twice sent to the State Departments of Education for verification and corrections. National percentile ranks were used for reporting whenever possible, but many states used alternative statistical reporting methods. The percentage of students testing above the 50 percentile was not available (N/A) from all states. The percentage of districts testing above average was gleaned from the state's publication when available.

Unless otherwise stated, the national norm is fifty. This study included only elementary grades one through six, except in the case of Idaho, where grade eight is the lowest grade tested.

ALABAMA
APRIL 1987

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM F NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	57,399	54	N/A	53	54	55	70.5%
2	52,146	51	N/A	63	56	57	78.3%
4	51,467	50	58	59	54	53	78.5%
5	48,471	48	55	60	52	50	58.5%

Mean Individual Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: Chief State School Officer's Report

ARKANSAS
SPRING 1987

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST
6th EDITION NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	29,491	60	63	67	64	65%	86.5%

National Percentile Rank from Mean Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: Arkansas Standardized Testing Program Report

ARIZONA
APRIL 1987

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM H NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	49,449	46	64	55	55	N/A	N/A
2	44,987	58	67	57	61	N/A	N/A
3	43,118	51	66	50	56	N/A	N/A
4	42,490	50	62	51	55	N/A	N/A
5	40,087	57	59	53	56	N/A	N/A
6	39,871	53	57	54	55	N/A	N/A

Percentage Of Children At Or Above 50th Percentile

*Number of Students Tested in Reading

SOURCE: Arizona Department of Education

CALIFORNIA
SPRING 1986

CALIFORNIA ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
(State Developed Test)
Scores Normed With CTBS/U NATIONAL NORMS
Matrix Sampling Technique 36 test forms for each grade level

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	310,008	55	51	63	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	287,478	54	54	66	N/A	N/A	N/A

Estimated National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: California Assessment Program Annual Report 1985-86

COLORADO
APRIL 1986

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average*	% of Districts Above Average
3	39,251	54	59	52	N/A	54.9%	77.5%
6	37,351	54	48	52	N/A	56.8%	69.7%

National Percentile Ranks
*In Reading

SOURCE: Results of the 1985-86 Colorado Student Testing Program

---

DELAWARE
APRIL 1986

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM V NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	N/A	52.6	N/A	58	N/A	N/A	100%
2	N/A	57	63.2	68.3	6? 2	N/A	100%
3	N/A	55	66	63	63.3	N/A	100%
4	N/A	56	57.5	60.1	57.6	N/A	100%
5	N/A	52.7	57.4	61.7	56.1	N/A	100%
6	N/A	54.1	59.8	61.6	59	N/A	100%

Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: Delaware Educational Assessment Program 1986 Statewide Test Results Summary Report

---

GEORGIA
SPRING 1987

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
2	81,769	61	71	73	68	65.8%	89.8%
4	76,627	53	59	62	57	71.9%	67.2%

National Mean Percentile Scores

SOURCE: 1986-87 Student Assessment Test Summary

HAWAII

SPRING 1987

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM E-7th EDITION NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	12,500	77 (42)	81 (46)	81 (75)	81 (N/A)	N/A	N/A
6	11,500	77 (49)	78 (55)	79 (76)	80 (N/A)	N/A	N/A

Percentage of children average and above average (Stanine 4 or above)
National Group Percentile Ranks in parentheses

SOURCE: Administrator of Testing--Hawaii Department of Education

---

IDAHO

MARCH-APRIL 1986

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
8	14,072	57	55	55	54	59.5%	80.2%

National Percentile Rank

SOURCE: Coordinator for Guidance, Assessment and Evaluation
Idaho State Department of Education

INDIANA

1983p84 (Last Year Results Collected)

Various Nationally Normed Tests
ITBS Most Common

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language (Composition)	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
Primary	N/A	87.9	89	86.2	85.1	N/A	N/A

Scores Reported as Percentage of Students in Stanine 4 or Above
(All scores indicate above-average achievement)

SOURCE: School Achievement in Indiana

IOWA

1986-87

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G & H NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	% of Students Above Average	% of Iowa Schools Above Average
K	68	86
1	74	90
2	72	91
3	71	90
4	72	92
5	73	94
6	73	96

SOURCE: Score Reports and Norms - 1986-87

KENTUCKY
APRIL 1986

KENTUCKY ESSENTIAL SKILLS TEST
MODIFICATION OF CTBS - FORM U

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	53,527	52.6	N/A	65.9	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	47,337	54.4	51.8	71.3	57.8	64.1%	93.3%
3	45,855	60.8	69.3	59.3	66.1	79.6%	100%
4	43,035	58.2	56.4	59.2	57.5	61.9%	92.7%
5	42,400	53	60.8	59.5	56.5	60.1%	92.7%
6	40,403	56.8	54.6	62.3	58.1	64.1%	95.5%

Scores in Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: KEST Statewide Testing Results

MAINE
1985-86

MAINE EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT (State Developed Test)
Matrix Sampling and Common Testing — 16 Different Tests

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Math	Social Studies	Science	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	14,012	+13.5	+6.9	+0.4	+2.2	N/A	N/A

Scores reported in terms of being above average in average percent correct

SOURCE: Maine Educational Assessment - 1985-86 State Summary and Interpretations Report

---

MARYLAND
FALL 1985

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM C — NATIONAL NORM

Grade	Number Tested	Reading Comprehension	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	37,458	3.6	3.8	3.5	N/A	N/A	95.8%
5	37,644	6.0	7.0	5.9	N/A	N/A	87.5%

Grade Equivalent Scale

SOURCE: Maryland Accountability Testing Program - Annual Report 1985-86

MISSISSIPPI
APRIL 1987

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM E — STANFORD NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	43,560	53.2	N/A	49.9	51.7	N/A	N/A
4	37,017	47.9	52.0	50.7	49.5	N/A	N/A
6	33,477	46.6	51.7	50.7	49.1	N/A	N/A
					50.1 (Average)		

Mean National Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: Skills Analysis for Mississippi 1987 Results

NEVADA
1985-86

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
7th EDITION NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	10,000	93	94	93	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	10,000	90	89	90	N/A	N/A	N/A

The percentage of students who scored in Stanine 4 or Above
(Only information available)

SOURCE: The Nevada Proficiency Examination Program - Results of 1985/1986 Examinations

---

NEW HAMPSHIRE
OCTOBER 1986

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM E NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	11,381	65	61	61	62	62.7%	100%

Median National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: Highlights of Results - 1986

NEW MEXICO
MARCH 1987

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM U NATIONAL 1981 NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	20,862	50.2	55.8	58.4	57.1	60%	80.7%
5	19,139	54.0	56.0	62.3	55	59%	79.6%

National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: New Mexico Standardized Testing Program Report - 1985-86 School Year
New Mexico Department of Education

NORTH CAROLINA
SPRING 1987

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST
FORM E NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	86,050	57	53	71	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	80,946	53	60	69	62	N/A	88.7%
3	79,892	54	60	63	58	N/A	87.9%
6	80,413	50	56	59	55	N/A	79.4%

Median National Percentile

SOURCE: Report of Student Performance, Division of Research

NORTH DAKOTA
SEPTEMBER 1986
(Both SRA and ITBS Used in North Dakota)

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM G NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
2	214	77	83	71	77	N/A	N/A
3	2,774	67	65	60	65	N/A	N/A
4	694	69	66	59	64	N/A	N/A
5	2,008	68	64	64	66	N/A	N/A
6	603	68	67	63	67	N/A	N/A

Percentile Rank of Average Grade Equivalent

SEPTEMBER 1986

SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
FORM P NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	785	63	N/A	69	55	N/A	N/A
2	1,033	69	64	66	69	N/A	N/A
3	2,495	72	68	56	65	N/A	N/A
4	1,277	74	72	62	72	N/A	N/A
5	2,286	71	68	66	70	N/A	N/A
6	1,055	73	68	71	72	N/A	N/A

National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: Director of Testing, North Dakota - Department of Public Instruction

---

OKLAHOMA
FEBRUARY 1987

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST
6th EDITION NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	41,100	62	60	61	64	N/A	79%

National Percentile Rank of Mean Normal Curve Equivalents

SOURCE: Oklahoma School Testing Program Summary Report - 1986

OREGON
FEBRUARY 1987

OREGON ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
(State Developed Test)
Equating Study with California Achievement Test
FORM E NATIONAL NORMS

Grade*	Number Tested**	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
8	4,513	58	N/A	49	N/A	N/A	N/A

National Percentile Rank

*Earliest Grade Tested

**Sample Of Students Tested

SOURCE: 1987 Eighth Grade Assessment of Reading, Mathematics and Writing Summary Report, July 1987

PENNSYLVANIA
MARCH 1987

TESTING FOR ESSENTIAL LEARNING AND LITERACY SKILLS (TELLS)
Equating Study with ITBS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	105,564	79.4*	N/A	84.6*	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	100,724	78.3*	N/A	81.6*	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mean Percent of Items Correct

*All scores are above the Estimated National Mean, but national norm is not 50 percentile

SOURCE: Testing for Essential Learning and Literacy Skills 1986-87 Statewide Test Results

---

RHODE ISLAND
SPRING 1986

RHODE ISLAND STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM Scores Normed with METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (MAT), Edition 6

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	8,310	64	64	59	63	63.9	94.7%
6	8,381	64	65	63	65	65.4	91.9%

Percentile Rank of Average Scores

SOURCE: Rhode Island State Assessment Program 1985-86 Basic Skills, Health Knowledge and Physical Fitness Testing Results

---

SOUTH CAROLINA
MARCH 1987

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS FORM U NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	44,946	56.1	64.3	67.6	61.2	62.9%	82.4%
5	42,831	50.9	59.4	64.2	54.4	54.5%	52.8%

Median National Percentile Scores

SOURCE: Preliminary Report of the 1987 Statewide Testing Program

---

SOUTH DAKOTA
APRIL 1987

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST FORM F NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	9,562	58.8 (85)	59.7 (90)	60.1 (91)	57.9	72%	N/A

Normal Curve Equivalents
National Percentile Ranks in parentheses

SOURCE: Skills Analysis for South Dakota State

TENNESSEE
SPRING 1987

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
7th EDITION NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
2	62,456	64	86	86	N/A	N/A	82.9%
5	57,717	52	66	68	N/A	N/A	61.9%

Group Percentile Rank of the Mean Scaled Scores

SOURCE: Tennessee Test Results - 1986-87

TEXAS
FEBRUARY 1986

TEXAS EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF MINIMUM SKILLS Equated with Metropolitan Achievement Test 6th Edition

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Writing	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
1	268,656	62	66	70	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	236,592	47	61	62	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	225,601	53	63	62	N/A	N/A	N/A

SOURCE: Student Performance Results for 1985 and 1986

UTAH
APRIL 1984

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM U NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested*	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
5	4,500	59	55	65	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Sample of students tested

Utah administers the test to students under strict security (no regular teachers administer the test)

SOURCE: Utah Statewide Educational Assessment General Report 1984

VIRGINIA
SPRING 1987

SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES TEST
LEVEL E - FORM 1 NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	67,567	58	62	61	N/A	N/A	60.5%

National Percentile Ranks

SOURCE: Virginia State Assessment Program 1986-87

WASHINGTON
OCTOBER 1986

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST
6th EDITION
NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	52,779	56	52	53	56	N/A	65.1%

Median National Percentile Rank

SOURCE: Washington Statewide Assessment Grades 4, 8, 10-Fall 1986

WEST VIRGINIA
MARCH 1987

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM U
NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
3	23,961	61	72	54	65	69.2%	98.2%
6	23,371	58	62	66	62	64.5%	92.7%

Mean Percentile Scores

SOURCE: Coordinator, West Virginia State-County Testing Program

---

WISCONSIN
FEBRUARY-MARCH 1986

COMPREHENSIVE TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
FORM U
NATIONAL NORMS

Grade	Number Tested	Reading	Language	Math	Total Battery	% of Students Above Average	% of Districts Above Average
4	1,500*	68	63	63	N/A	N/A	N/A

Median National Percentile Rank
*Sample Of Students Tested
SOURCE: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

TABLE III

In sixteen states, the State Departments of Education had no knowledge of individual district results. The largest districts in those sixteen states were surveyed by telephone and asked if their elementary (1-6) total basic battery scores were above, at, or below the national average. In most cases all scores at all grade levels were above the stated national norm. If some grade levels tested below and others tested above, then above average was defined as an average normal curve equivalent for the six grades that exceeded fifty, or four of the six grades exceeding the stated national norm in total basic skills. If the total basic skills or basic battery scores were not available, then scores for reading, language, and math were used.

In ten of these states, all districts surveyed were above average. In four states, one district was below average, one state had two districts below average and one state (Ohio) had three districts below average (but ten above average). Of the 167 largest districts surveyed by telephone, 150 were above average (90 percent), thirteen were below average and four districts refused to release the information.

Twenty additional districts in one state (Michigan) were randomly selected from the state directory and surveyed by telephone. Ninety-five percent (19 of 20) of these randomly selected districts were above average.

ALASKA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Anchorage	ITBS	"Above Average"
Fairbanks	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
MATSU	SRA	"Above Average"
Kenai Peninsula	SRA	"Above Average"
Juneau	SRA	"Above Average"
Ketchikan	SRA	"Above Average"
Kodiak	ITBS	"Above Average"

CONNECTICUT

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Hartford	MAT	"Above Average"
Bridgeport	MAT 6	"Above Average"
New Haven	MAT 6	"Above Average"
Waterbury	ITBS-H	Refused
Stamford	STEP	"Above Average"
Norwalk	CTBS	"Above Average"
Danbury	ITBS	"Above Average"
Bristol	SAT	"Above Average"
Meriden	ITBS	"Above Average"
Greenwich	SAT	"Above Average"
Britain	SAT	Refused
Enfield	CAT	"Above Average"

FLORIDA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Dade County	SAT-E/F	"Below Average"
Broward County	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Hillsboro County	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Duval County	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Pinellas County	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Palm Beach County	SAT	"Above Average"
Orange County	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Polk County	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Brevard County	CTBS-U/V	"Above Average"
Seminole County	CTBS-U/V	"Above Average"
Lee County	CAT-C	"Above Average"

ILLINOIS

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Chicago	ITBS-7	"Below Average"
Rockford	NTBS-85	"Above Average"
Elgian Unit	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
East St. Louis	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Peoria	SRA	"Above Average"
Springfield	CAT-E/F	"Above Average"
Schaumberg	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Decatur	SRA-P	"Above Average"
Valley View	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Waukegan	CAT-E/F	"Below Average"
Dundee	SAT-82	"Above Average"

KANSAS

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Wichita	ITBS	"Above Average"
Shawnee-Mission	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Kansas City	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Topeka	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Olathe	ITBS	"Above Average"
Junction City	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Manhatten	ITBS-85	"Above Average"
Garden City	SRA-85	"Above Average"
Emporia	SRA-85	"Above Average"

LOUISIANA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
# 1	CTBS	"Above Average"
# 2	CTBS	"Below Average"
# 3	CAT	"Above Average"
# 4	SAT	"Above Average"
# 5	SRA	"Above Average"
# 6	CAT	"Above Average"
# 7	SRA	"Above Average"

Results obtained directly from the Louisiana Department of Education. Names of the Districts were not released.

MASSACHUSETTS

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Boston	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Springfield	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Worcester	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Brockton	CAT	"Above Average"
New Bedford	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Fall River	MAT-5	"Above Average"
Lynn	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Newton	STEP	"Above Average"
Quincy	CTBS	"Above Average"
Cambridge	SAT-7	"Above Average"

MICHIGAN

20 Largest Districts:

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Detroit	CAT-E	"Below Average"
Flint	ITBS	"Below Average"
Grand Rapids	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Lansing	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Utica	ITBS	"Above Average"
Wayne Westland	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Pontiac	CAT-E	"Below Average"
Warren	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Saginaw	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Livonia	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Plymouth Canton	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Taylor	CTBS-U	Refused
Ann Arbor	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Port Huron	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Waterford	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Dearborn	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Bay City	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Troy	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Jenison	SAT	"Above Average"
Three Rivers	ITBS	"Below Average"

20 Randomly Selected Districts:

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Hopkins	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Niles	SAT	"Above Average"
Pennfield	ITBS	"Above Average"
Big Bay De Noc	SAT-E/F	"Above Average"
Littlefield	SAT-E	"Above Average"
Westwood Heights	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Vandercook Lake	ITBS	"Above Average"
Schoolcraft	SRA	"Above Average"
Brandon	CTBS-TCS/U	"Above Average"
Wyandotte City	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Walkerville Rural	ITBS	"Below Average"
Vestaburg	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Big Rapids	MAT-6	"Above Average"
St. Ignace Area	SRA	"Above Average"
Delton Kellogg	CAT/SAT	"Above Average"
Beaverton Rural	CTBS	"Above Average"
Highland Park	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Battle Creek	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Byron Center	ITBS-7&8	"Above Average"
Nice	SAT	"Above Average"

MINNESOTA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Minneapolis	SAT	"Above Average"
	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Anoka	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
St. Paul	SRA	"Above Average"
Osseo	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Rosemount	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Bloomington	SAT-82	"Above Average"
Moundsview	CTBS-U/V	"Above Average"
St. Cloud	CTBS-81	"Above Average"

MISSOURI

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
St. Louis	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Kansas City	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Springfield	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Parkway	SRA	"Above Average"
Hazelwood	SRA	"Above Average"
North Kansas	ITBS-7/8	"Above Average"
St. Joseph	SRA	"Above Average"
Columbia	ITBS-86	"Above Average"
Francis Howell	CTBS-81	"Above Average"
Mehlville	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Blue Springs	ITBS-82	"Above Average"
Fox	CAT-C/D-85	"Above Average"

MONTANA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Billings	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Great Falls	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Helena	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Butte	SAT-E	"Above Average"
Missoula	ITBS-7	"Above Average"

NEBRASKA

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Omaha	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Lincoln	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Millard	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Bellevue	ITBS-7	"Above Average"
Grand Island	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Papillion-La Vista	CAT-E/F	"Above Average"
Westside	CTBS	"Above Average"
South Sioux City	SRA	"Above Average"

NEW JERSEY

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Newark	CTBS-U	"Below Average"
Jersey City	CAT-E	Refused
Patterson	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Camden	CTBS	Refused
Toms River	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Elizabeth	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Trenton	CAT-C	"Above Average"
East Orange	CAT-C	"Above Average"
Hamilton Township	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Cherry Hill Township	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Bayonne City	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Allendale	CAT-E	"Above Average"

NEW YORK

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
New York City	MAT-6/DRP	"Above Average"
Buffalo	SAT-N	"Above Average"
Rochester	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Syracuse	SRA	"Above Average"
Yonkers	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Sachem	SAT	"Above Average"
Middle Country	SAT-81	"Above Average"
Greece	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Spring Valley	ITBS	"Above Average"

OHIO

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Cleveland	CTBS	"Below Average"
Columbus	CTBS-U/V	"Above Average"
Cincinnati	CAT-C/D	"Above Average"
Toledo	ITBS	"Above Average"
Akron	CAT-C	"Above Average"
So. Western City	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Youngstown City	SAT-7	"Below Average"
Canton	ITBS-G	"Above Average"
Loraine City	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Springfield City	ITBS-G	"Below Average"
Westerville City	ITBS	"Above Average"
Elyria City	CAT-E	"Above Average"
Warren	MAT-6	"Above Average"

VERMONT

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
# 1	SAT-7	"Above Average"
# 2	SAT-7	"Below Average"
# 3	SAT-7&6	"Above Average"
# 4	CAT-E	"Above Average"
# 5	MAT-6	"Above Average"
# 9	SAT-7	"Above Average"

WYOMING

DISTRICT	NAME OF TEST	REPORTED RESULTS
Laramie	SRA	"Above Average"
Natrona	SAT-7	"Above Average"
Campbell	ITBS	"Above Average"
Sweetwater # 1	CTBS-U	"Above Average"
Albany	MAT-6	"Above Average"
Sheridan # 2	SRA	"Above Average"
Vinta	SRA	"Above Average"

TABLE IV

Table IV includes the scores for the first year of use of three recently renormed achievement tests. If the norms used are accurate initially, Friends for Education thought that the scores for the first year of use should approximate the stated national norm of 50 percentile (some states above fifty and some below). Instead, all states were above average at all elementary grade levels tested except for three grades in Arizona. Even Georgia, North Carolina, Arkansas and Oklahoma tested above average in the first year of use.

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS - FORMS G/H
RENORMED 1984-85
FIRST USED 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR

STATE	DATE ADMINISTERED	GRADES TESTED	RESULTS (Percentile Rank For Total Battery)
Arizona	Fall 1986	1 through 6	1-3 Above Average (N/A) 4-6 Below Average (N/A)
Colorado	Spring 1986	3;6	Above Average (54;54)
Georgia	Spring 1986	2;4	Above Average (60;52)
Idaho	Spring 1986	8	Above Average (54)
Iowa	1985-86	K through 6	Above Average (N/A)
North Dakota	Fall 1985	3;5	Above Average (74;75)

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST - FORM E
RENORMED 1984-85
FIRST USED 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR

STATE	DATE ADMINISTERED	GRADES TESTED	RESULTS (Percentile Rank For Total Battery)
New Hampshire	October 1985	4	Above Average (55.6)
North Carolina	Spring 1986	2;3;6	Above Average (57;57;53)

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST
6TH EDITION -- RENORMED 1984-85
FIRST USED 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR

STATE	DATE ADMINISTERED	GRADES TESTED	RESULTS (Percentile Rank For Total Battery)
Arkansas	Spring 1986	4	Above Average (64)
Oklahoma	Spring 1986	3	Above Average (59)
Washington	Fall 1985	4	Above Average (55)

TABLE V

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST

TEST	CAT-C (1978)	CAT-E (1985)
Level	13	13
Recommended Grade	2.6-3.9	2.6-4.2
Reading Questions	27	35
Correct responses needed for 50th percentile (Grade 3 fall norms)	22/27	29/35
Seconds allowed per question	60	73
Number of expository passages	3	5
Total expository words	425	688
Total expository syllables	562	866
Total sentences	44	76
Average syllables/100 words	132.2	125.8
Average sentences/100 words	10.35	11.05
Average Frye Readability	4	3
Range of readability of passages	3-5	2-4

The newer test is recommended for a slightly higher grade level, allows more time per question has easier words and shorter sentences. The increased number of total words on the E might account for the increased time allowed.

STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

TEST	SAT-A (1972)	SAT-E (1982)
Level	Intermediate Level 1	Intermediate Level 1
Recommended Grade	(4.5-6.4)	(4.5-5.9)
Reading Questions	72	60
Correct responses needed for 50th percentile (Grade 5, fall norms)	33/72	39/60
Seconds allowed per question	29	30
Number of expository passages	10	7
Total expository words	1392	1218
Total expository syllables	1949	1608
Total sentences	64	92
Average syllables/100 words	140	132
Average sentences/100 words	4.60	7.55
Average Frye Readability	8	6
Range of readability of passages	7-12	2-10

The newer test has a profound drop in expository reading difficulty obvious to any casual reader. The newer test does require a higher correct response rate and is no longer recommended for early 6th grade.

REFERENCES

"State Education Statistics Supplement Student Performance and Resource Inputs 1985-1986." Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Education Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, February 1987.

"Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics, 1987." Thomas D. Snyder, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. U.S. Department of Education.

"The NAEP 1985-1986 Reading Anomaly: A Technical Report" Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J., December 1987.

"Who Reads Best? The Nation's Report Card." Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J., February 1988.